

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION AT DAYTON**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	:	Case No. 3:20-cr-00033
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	District Judge Michael J. Newman
	:	Magistrate Judge Caroline H. Gentry
vs.	:	
	:	
GLEN D. POLLARD,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	

**ORDER REVOKING BOND AND REMANDING
DEFENDANT TO THE CUSTODY OF THE U.S. MARSHAL**

This case came before the Court on March 1, 2023 for a Bond Revocation Hearing. Defendant was represented by his counsel. Defendant admitted the violations described in the Petition dated February 17, 2023 and the email from Mr. Joshua Bohman dated March 1, 2023. The Court heard argument from counsel for the Government and Defendant.

Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3148(b)(1)(A), the Court finds probable cause to believe that Defendant committed a Federal, State or local crime while on release, and finds by clear and convincing evidence that Defendant has violated a condition of his release. The Court further finds that Defendant is unlikely to abide by any condition or combination of conditions of release. 18 U.S.C. § 3148(b)(2)(B). Therefore, the Government's request to revoke Defendant's bond is **GRANTED**.

Accordingly, it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

- 1) Defendant's bond is revoked and Defendant shall be remanded to the custody of the U.S. Marshal;
2. Defendant shall be committed to the custody of the Attorney General of the United States for confinement in a corrections facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or being held in custody pending appeal;
- 3) Defendant shall be afforded reasonable opportunity for private consultation with counsel; and
- 4) On Order of a Court of the United States, or upon request of an attorney for the United States, the person in charge of the facility in which Defendant is confined shall deliver Defendant to a United States Marshal or his deputy for the purpose of an appearance in connection with a court proceeding.

Any party may, within fourteen (14) days after this Order is filed, file and serve on the opposing party a motion for reconsideration by a District Judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A), Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). The motion must specifically designate the order or part in question and the basis for any objection. Responses to objections are due ten days after objections are filed and replies by the objecting party are due seven days thereafter. The District Judge, upon consideration of the motion, shall set aside any part of this Order found to be clearly erroneous or contrary to law.

Defendants who appeal to a United States District Judge from this Order must, at the same time as filing the motion for reconsideration, order a transcript of the detention

hearing. This order is in full force and effect, notwithstanding the filing of any objections, unless stayed by the Magistrate Judge or District Judge. S.D. Ohio Civ. R. 72.4.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

March 1, 2023

s/Caroline H. Gentry

Caroline H. Gentry

United States Magistrate Judge